

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of August 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yamada* et al. (US 7,102,282). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 recite a light emitting device including a driving substrate and a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on the driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the first electrode, and a second electrode on the light emitting layer which acts as a semi transparent reflective layer and where the first and second electrodes reflect light.

This is clearly unlike *Yamada* which fails to disclose or even suggest a light emitting device including a driving substrate and a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on the driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the first electrode, and a second electrode on the light emitting layer which acts as a semi transparent reflective layer and where the first and second electrodes reflect light. Instead, *Yamada* discloses a substrate 11, a first electrode 12 on the substrate, an organic layer 13 on the first electrode 11, a semi transparent reflection layer 14 on the organic layer 13 and a second transparent electrode 15 on the semi-transparent reflection layer 14. See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,282, Col. 10, l. 12-23; Fig. 13.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing a light emitting device including a driving substrate and a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on the driving substrate, a

light emitting layer on the first electrode, and a second electrode on the light emitting layer which acts as a semi transparent reflective layer and where the first and second electrodes reflect light, the amount of light reflected can be reduced to 20% or less which improves image quality.

See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0156405, Para [0053]-[0056].

Therefore, because *Yamada* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 cannot stand. Because claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, they are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, 8 and 9.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 16, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000